Claims

1. Apparatus for assessing the cost effectiveness of an advertising campaign, the apparatus comprising:

a) an input for receiving

i) a first set of data from at least one first data source; and

ii) a second set of data from at least one second data source;

b) an output; and

c) a processor arranged to:

i) aggregate and analyse the first set of data using at least one metric in order to provide output data, each of said at least one metric assessing a different characteristic of the first set of data;

ii) calculate a quality score according to a first scoring algorithm applied to the output data;

iii) calculate a cost premium from the second set of data according to a second scoring algorithm; and

iv) transmit to the output a graphical and quantitative comparison of the cost premium and the quality score, the cost premium being relative to a cost benchmark and the quality score being relative to a quality benchmark.

2. Apparatus as claimed in claim 1, wherein:

a) the input is arranged for receiving a third set of data, the third set of data concerning the at least one competitor advertising campaign during the advertising campaign starting on a campaign start date and ending on a campaign end date, the third set of data comprising information concerning the same features as the first data;

b) the processor is arranged to aggregate and analyse the third set of data, with the first set of data, using at least one metric in order to provide at least one output result, each at least one metric assessing a different characteristic of the third set of data and the first set of data; and

c) the first scoring algorithm comprises a scoring function, the scoring function being a routine that awards a quality score to the campaign.

3. Apparatus as claimed in claimed 1, wherein:

a) the input is arranged for receiving a fourth set of data, the fourth set of data concerning the at least one competitor advertising campaign for a duration of the advertising campaign having a campaign start date and a campaign end date, the fourth set of data comprising information concerning the same features as the second set of data; and

b) the second algorithm comprises a comparative function, the second comparative function comparing the second set of data with the fourth set of data.

4. Apparatus as claimed in claim 1, wherein each transmission of an advertisement on a venue is a spot, and said first set of data comprises data about each spot including spot data; a spot time; and a spot duration.

5. Apparatus as claimed as claim 1, wherein the first set of data comprises data about the campaign including: a campaign start date and a campaign end date.

6. Apparatus as claimed as in claim 1, wherein the first set of data comprises data relating to planned ratings for the advertising campaign.

7. Apparatus as claimed as in claim 1, wherein the first set of data comprises data relating to calculated ratings for each program transmitted on a venue.

8. Apparatus as claimed as in claim 1, wherein the second set of data comprises a costings information set for each venue.

9. Apparatus as claimed in claim 8, wherein the costings information set comprises information for each program transmitted on each venue.

10. Apparatus claimed as in claim 1, wherein the first set of data comprises data relating to program ratings for each program transmitted on a venue, where said processor operates to match each calculated program rating with a corresponding costing information set.

11. Apparatus as claimed in claim 10, wherein the first set of data comprises dates relating to program ratings for each program and on a venue, where said apparatus is configured to allow an operator to match manually each calculated program rating with a corresponding information set.

12. Apparatus claimed as in any of claims 1, 2 or 3, wherein said apparatus further comprises an output database, said processor transmitting said output data, said quality score and said cost premium to said output database for storage.

13. A method for assessing the cost effectiveness of an advertising campaign, the method comprising the steps of:

a) receiving a first set of data from at least one first data source;

b) processing the first set of data to provide output data by aggregating and analysing the data by means of at least one metric, said at least one metric assessing a different characteristic of the first set of data;

c) processing the output data according to a first scoring algorithm to calculate a quality score;

d) receiving a second set of data from at least one second data source;

e) processing the second set of data according to a second scoring algorithm to calculate a cost premium; and

f) graphically outputting an image showing a quantitative comparison of the cost premium and the quality score, the cost premium being relative to a cost benchmark, and the quality score being relative to a quality benchmark.

14. A method as claimed in claim 13, wherein said advertising campaign is publicised by means of TV advertisements.

15. A method as claimed as in claim 13, wherein said at least one metric considers the daypart of each spot.

16. A method as claimed in claim 13, wherein said at least one metric considers the venue of each spot.

17. A method claimed as in claim 16, wherein said venue is a network TV station and said at least one metric considers the distributor on which each spot is transmitted.

18. A method claimed as in claim 13, wherein said at least one metric considers the calculated rating of each spot.

19. A method claimed as in claim 18, wherein said at least one metric also considers the planned rating for the advertising campaign.

20. A method claimed as in claim 13, wherein said at least one metric considers the location of each spot in a POD.